

In our original appeal, we noted that when Zeller made the correction to *Gracilaria* in 1839, he did not make a separate statement saying, in effect, "I am correcting the mis-spelling *Gracillaria* to *Gracilaria* because..." Our opponents believe that he should have said that he was making a correction, but there was no Code in 1839 making such a statement mandatory. That he was making such a correction is to us self-evident. We believe that Zeller made a legitimate correction, and Meyrick, a teacher of classics, rightly followed suit.

In summary, we wish to say that we continue to believe that *Gracillaria* is a simple case of mis-spelling and thus is subject to correction under the provisions of the Code. As noted in our original document, we share the opinion of scholars who were well versed in the classics and who spelled the word correctly as *Gracilaria*.

COMMENT ON PROPOSALS FOR STABILIZATION OF THE NAMES OF CERTAIN GENERA AND SPECIES OF HOLOTHURIOIDEA. Z.N.(S.) 1782 (see volume 24, pages 98-115)

By Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*)

Even for trained Commissioners it is often a hard job to find the winding path down to the firm bottom of intricate nomenclatorial problems. It would be a great help if all applicants would realise this fact and try to keep out of their applications everything not pertinent to the nomenclatorial problem to be discussed. Worst of all are those lengthy papers where nomenclatorial matters are mixed up with all kind of other things so that Commissioners are forced to read a whole systematic paper outside their own field in order to pick up those problems that may afford treatment. The B.Z.N. should not become a place for easy publication of systematic papers. The application by A. M. Clark and F. W. E. Rowe constitutes such a case, as I shall demonstrate in detail below. Also, their proposals are of the dangerous gross type that experience shows are apt to lead to confusion because each item tends to be shortened down too much, or to be too superficially handled. The applications by Hemming (published posthumously) that appeared in recent issues of this journal are examples of how such things should be handled, one by one, and separately. As a Commissioner, I am inclined to refuse voting on mixed applications of the type presented by Clark & Rowe.

- (1) *Sporadipus*. Fully presented except that information on established practice is lacking.
- (2) *Thelenota*. No information on the degree of usage of this name in the family STICHOPODIDAE.
- (3) *Trepang*. Fully presented.
- (4) *Microthele*. No case at all.
- (5) *Stichopus*. No nomenclatorial problem concerning *Perideris*. The other half of the petition concerns the possible replacement by *Gymnochirotia* Brandt of *Semperothuria* or *Mertensiothuria*, both of Deichmann, 1958. It is not explained how these latter names have already become so fully established that they warrant protection.
- (6) *Ludwigiothuria*. No case.
- (7) *Bohadschia*. No case. (What is the intention of the bewildering reference to case no. 1)?
- (8) and (9) No case. Even, *Mülleria* is not proposed for the Index.
- (10) *Fistularia*. I fail to see any proposals concerning this name. No case.
- (11) *Cystipus*. No proposals, no case.
- (12) *Ananus*. A mere nomen dubium of no importance. No case.
- (13) *Diploperideris*. as (12).
- (14) *Eostichopus*. A nomen nudum, thus no case.
- (15) *Cuvieria*. Preoccupied. No case.

- (16) *Cladodactyla*. No case. The uncertainty may be set at rest some day, but anyhow there is no danger of confusion for the time being.  
(17) and (18) *Thyonidium* and *Duasmodactyla*. A good case.  
(19) *Dactylota*. No case.  
(20) *Aspidochir*. A nomen dubium. No acute danger.  
(21) *Liosoma*. A completely plain case of taxonomy, not of Nomenclature.  
(22) *Oncinolabes*. As far as *mollis* is concerned, there might be a case here.  
(23) *Tiedemannia*. A nomen dubium. No case.

As to the many specific names proposed for suppression, only

*Holothuria glaberrima*

*Cladodactyla nigricans*

*Cuvieria Stichaensis*

*Holothuria Drummondi*

and *Holothuria pellucida*

seem to constitute cases worthy of consideration.

May I suggest that the items contained in the numbers (generic part) 1), 2), 3), 5), 17 and 18), and 22) and (specific part) 1), 14), 22), 27), 31), 32), 33) be resubmitted individually for consideration.

#### ADDITIONAL COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED REJECTION OF *COLUBER*

*CHIAMETLA* SHAW, 1802. Z.N.(S.) 1704

(see volume 22, pages 235-236, volume 24, page 138)

By Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61803, U.S.A.*)

The recommendation by Peters (1967, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 24 (3) : 138) that the petition for rejection of *Coluber chiametla* Shaw, 1802, suggests in general terms that the name *Drymobius margaritiferus* (Schlegel, 1837), which has been consistently used for this species for over a century, is not sufficiently widely used by non-herpetologists or even by herpetologists themselves to warrant use of the plenary powers of the Commission for its preservation. I wish merely to point out that I am aware of about 125 works, in the literature pertaining solely to Mexico and Guatemala. Since the species ranges from southern Texas to northern South America it is likely that at least twice as many references to the species occur in all literature as in the Mexican-Guatemalan component. These surely represent at least 200 different works. Some are popular, some strictly ecological, although most are taxonomic or distributional.

The species is perhaps the most common snake in lowland Mexico, is represented by large numbers in museums, is widely distributed, and is frequently exhibited in zoos. However as Peters points out it is not a species known in the non-herpetological literature except for a few ecological works.